

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Addiese: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P O Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.wepto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/532,483	04/22/2005	John A. Organiscak	6395-67118-05	4284
24197 KLAROUIST	7590 12/02/2009 SPARKMAN, LLP	EXAMINER		
121 SW SALN		ALEXANDER, LYLE		
SUITE 1600 PORTLAND,	OR 97204		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/02/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/532,483	ORGANISCAK ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
LYLE A. ALEXANDER	1797	

	LYLE A. ALEXANDER	1797					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence ado	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 23 January 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.					
 X The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of App for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 (approximation) 	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavi eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, with 37 CFR 41.31; o	which places the r (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.						
The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.							
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(FIRST REPLY WAS FI	LED WITHIN TWO				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of ex under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checket. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patient term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL.	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1: tension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropri nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee to action; or (2) as				
The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp.	liance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
<u>AMENDMENTS</u>							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			cause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		E below);					
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		I de la					
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bel appeal; and/or 	ter form for appeal by materially rec	lucing or simplifying t	ne issues for				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1							
The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)							
Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	lowable if submitted in a separate, t	imely filed amendme	nt canceling the				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pror The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: none.		be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .							
Claim(s) rejected: 1-26.							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. Se	and/or appellant fail ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1	s to provide a).				
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.				
11. 🗵 The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.							
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
13. Other:							
	AME A ALEVANDED!						
	/LYLE A ALEXANDER/ Primary Examiner Art U	nit 1797					

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06)

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The creation of new independent claims from finally rejected dependent claims would require further consideration and new grounds of rejection using the cited art of record.

Continuation of 11, does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The Office will vacate the 35 USC 112 second paragraph rejections in light of Applicants' remarks upon further appeal. The Office maintains Sharp(WO 02063294) teaches filtration/removal of carbon dioxide from the air as taught on page 14 and acknowledged by Applicants' in their remarks. Applicants' have amended some of their claims to specifically claim the filtered contaminant. However, the claimed contaminant include carbon dioxide which is indistinguishable from Sharp. The Office agrees with Applicant that Roberts only teaches detection of tracer gases in the halogen family. Upon further appeal, claims that are directed to detection of carbon dioxide, nitrogen and oxygen as throac gas will define over Roberts. Finally, the Office regrets that an interview summary of the 11/10/00 interview was not sent to Applicant. It appears this was an oversight made by the Examiner. The Examiner concurs with Applicants' characterization of the interview.